

1
2
3
4
5
6
7
8 UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
9 WESTERN DISTRICT OF WASHINGTON
10 AT TACOMA

11 MUHAMMED TILLISY,

12 Plaintiff,

13 v.

14 WASHINGTON STATE
15 DEPARTMENT OF CORRECTIONS,
16 et. al.,

Defendants.

CASE NO. 18-5695 RJB-JRC

ORDER DENYING APPEAL
FROM MAGISTRATE JUDGE
ORDER

17 THIS MATTER comes before the Court on Plaintiff's appeal of an order of Magistrate
18 Judge J. Richard Creatura denying Plaintiff's motion to appoint counsel without prejudice (Dkt.
19 30). Dkt. 33. The Court deems it unnecessary for Defendant to respond to the motion, which is
20 otherwise ripe for consideration.

21 In denying Plaintiff's motion to appoint counsel, the magistrate judge explained that
22 because there is no right to counsel in § 1983 cases and courts appoint counsel only in
23 exceptional circumstances. After weighing the likelihood of success on the merits and the
24 complexity of the case, the magistrate judge concluded that Plaintiff had not made a showing of

1 exceptional circumstances and denied the request for appointment of counsel without prejudice.
2 Dkt. 30. Plaintiff was informed that he “may file a new motion for appointment of counsel once
3 the case has further developed.” *Id.*, at 3.

4 Plaintiff’s appeal again argues that he has a vision impairment, making it difficult for his
5 to see ordinary sized print. Dkt. 33. He asserts that he should be appointed counsel.

6 Fed. R. Civ. P. 72 (a) provides:

7 (a) Nondispositive Matters. When a pretrial matter not dispositive of a party's claim or
8 defense is referred to a magistrate judge to hear and decide, the magistrate judge must
9 promptly conduct the required proceedings and, when appropriate, issue a written order
10 stating the decision. A party may serve and file objections to the order within 14 days
after being served with a copy. A party may not assign as error a defect in the order not
timely objected to. The district judge in the case must consider timely objections and
modify or set aside any part of the order that is clearly erroneous or is contrary to law.

11 Applied here, the magistrate judge’s order, denying the motion to appoint counsel
12 without prejudice, (Dkt. 30) should be affirmed. Plaintiff’s appeal does not make a showing of
13 clear error by the magistrate judge in his denial, without prejudice, of the request for
14 appointment of counsel. *See Franklin v. Murphy*, 745 F.2d 1221, 1236 (9th Cir. 1984);
15 *Weygandt v. Look*, 718 F.2d 952, 954 (9th Cir. 1983). Review of the Amended Complaint shows
16 that even if Plaintiff had shown a likelihood of success on the merits, Plaintiff has demonstrated
17 an ability to adequately articulate issues to the Court. The issues raised in the Amended
18 Complaint are not overly complex. At this stage, the Plaintiff’s appeal (Dkt. 33) should be denied
19 and the order (Dkt. 30) affirmed. The case should be re-referred to U.S. Magistrate Judge J.
20 Richard Creatura for further proceedings.

21 It is **ORDERED** that:

- 22 • Plaintiff’s Notice of Appeal (Dkt. 33) **IS DENIED**.
- 23
- 24

- 1 • The Order Denying Motion to Appoint Counsel Without Prejudice (Dkt. 30) **IS**
2 **AFFIRMED**;
- 3 • The case **IS RE-REFERRED** to U.S. Magistrate Judge J. Richard Creatura for
4 further proceedings.

5 The Clerk is directed to send uncertified copies of this Order to all counsel of record and
6 to any party appearing *pro se* at said party's last known address.

7 Dated this 5th day of March, 2019.

8 
9

10 ROBERT J. BRYAN
11 United States District Judge
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24